

1. The solicitation for the elevator states the below for the evaluation criteria:

*Sub-Factor 1b - Key Personnel: Provide the names of the Prime Contractor's project manager and on-site superintendent, elevator mechanic or technicians including name with title, years with prime contractor, and total work experience as it relates to elevator maintenance, repairs, alteration, renovation or installation. Listing any certifications in elevator maintenance that is held by the key personnel.*

*Standard for Acceptability: Project manager and the on-site superintendent must have a minimum of two (2) or more years of experience managing construction of elevator maintenance, repair, alteration, renovation or installation in a hospital environment.*

Since I would anticipate that there are very few if any SDVOSB's that will have elevator mechanics on their own (prime contractor) staff, can the statement be revised to say something to the effect of:

*Sub-Factor 1b - Key Personnel: Provide the names of the Prime Contractor's project manager and on-site superintendent including name with title and years with the prime contractor. In addition, provide the name(s) of elevator mechanics or technicians who will be assigned to the project including name with title, and total work experience as it relates to elevator maintenance, repairs, alteration, renovation or installation. Listing any certifications in elevator maintenance that is held by the key personnel.*

*Standard for Acceptability: Project manager and the on-site superintendent must have a minimum of two (2) or more years of experience managing construction of elevator maintenance, repair, alteration, renovation or installation in a hospital environment.*

As it is currently written, it appears that the elevator mechanic would need to work for the prime contractor. I think this would significantly impact the number of qualified bidders that would be able to submit a proposal.

Answer : **Our market research confirmed that there were 2 or more SDVOSB companies with elevator experience and had the capability to perform the requirements of the contract, which is why that is part of our evaluation criteria**

2. Specification Section 14 21 10, Section 1.5, E, 2b (Alternate No.1) states to reuse the existing controllers. Specification Section 14 21 10, Section 2.10.B (Alternate No.1) says to provide a controller. Under Alternate No.1 are we to reuse or provide a new controller?

**Answer: Revise the line in Section 1.5, E, 2b: 2B. ALTERNATE NO.1: PROVIDE CONTROLLER SUITED FOR EXISTING HOISTING MACHINE MOTOR.**

3. Specification Section 14 21 10, Section 2.12 States to reuse the group controller. If we are replacing the controllers we cannot reuse the group controller.

**ANSWER: REVISE: Title of 2.12, it shall read: 2.12 GROUP SELECTIVE COLLECTIVE AUTOMATIC OPERATION**

**Note: The controller providing this function shall be provided by contractor.**

4. RE: Page 10, Offeror Submission Requirements, Number 6, Past Performance

Can a completed CPARS be submitted in lieu of the provided Past Performance Questionnaires for the above referenced project?

**Answer: All Offerors/Bidders must comply with the requirements of the solicitation and have the Past Performance questionnaires completed and sent (by way of email ) to the Contracting Officer.**

5. The Solicitation documents state that the Period of Performance, from date of NTP, shall be 180 days. Will the VA provide a greater period of time than the 180 days for performance if the Awardee can provide verifiable data that the full project scope of work cannot be completed within the 180 day time frame?

This is based upon preliminary information from our development of a cost proposal for this project. The professional elevator supplier/servicer/installer that we have teamed with has provided a baseline schedule for this project. It has been created for the work requested and the material specified in the plan documents. Much of the new product must be manufactured and delivered prior to installation. This process involves lengthy lead times where some work cannot be performed which results in a negative deduction of time from that 180 day period. The current tentative schedule, without significant overtime labor, pushes the project well beyond the 180 days allotted (start to finish).

An additional constraint for scheduling is that much of the work is phased in such a way that modernization of the equipment is limited to keep some of the other elevator units in service for daily use. While that is certainly a practical and understandable condition, it only serves to increase the time to perform the required scope of work to each elevator component.

It is our preliminary concern that the 180 day period will not be adequate for procurement of material and for timely installation.

**Answer: The government will consider adjusting the timing if there is a reasonable, verifiable data that the scope of work could not be completed within the 180 day performance period. The government would determine what would be considered verifiable data? For example, Backlog or lead time statements from three (or all) pre-approved manufactures?**

**Examples of what kinds of data are unacceptable?**

**The limitations of work that can be accomplished by a single crew, manufacture or provider is not sufficient. Bidders are to consider use of multiple crews, multiple shifts and means and methods to meet the performance requirements of the contract.**

6. Will the VA please provide the list of site visit attendees for the subject project?

**Answer: The official site visit list is being provided with this amendment**